

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Response to rejections/objections

Claim 1 was objected to because the term "the sequence" lacked antecedent basis. The claim has been amended to remove this term.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. The claim has been cancelled.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiao in view of Li et al. The Office acknowledged, however, that claim 7 is directed to allowable subject matter. The limitations of claim 7 are incorporated into independent claim 1, and claims 2 and 4-7 are cancelled. Accordingly, claim 1 is now in condition for immediate allowance.

New claim 8 is a method claim whose scope is comparable to the scope of allowable device claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

LUMEN I.P. SERVICES

2345 Yale Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306

(650) 424-0100

BY



Thomas J. McFarlane

Reg. No 39,299